



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sonal issue with those who saw fit to oppose him, teaching his lessons, living his life, dying, today his statue in bronze adorns the public park in his native city, and, what is more, the memory of his heroic spirit lives in every life of that city, and will forever.

I recall another character, a man none the less real because we meet him in a work of fiction. He is still alive in Hugo's *Les Misérables*, the greatest novel I have ever read. This man's name is Jean Valjean. In all the pages of song or story I know of no character more firmly and wonderfully drawn. The pathos, the agony, the luminous spirit of that ex-convict as he moves the very world about him, not by physical force, though he was possessed of great stores of that, but by his hyper-resistance to the forces which would so unjustly persecute and kill him. I recall especially his revenge upon that stern and unjust disciple of justice, Javert—Javert, who had driven him from position and influence, who had hounded him for years through the streets of Paris; Javert, who had caused him to live a veritable death on the face of the earth. This brutal policeman, the story runs, was at last a prisoner of Valjean's, and the time had come for the noble hero to rid himself of his ignoble foe. Notwithstanding the shots that were aimed constantly in their direction from behind the barricade, Valjean undid the rope which fastened Javert at the waist and signaled him to rise. Javert obeyed. They went over the wall, Valjean with pistol in hand. They reached a secluded spot. Valjean took from his pocket a clasp-knife. He cut the martingale around the neck of the haughty officer. Then he cut the ropes around the wrists, and then those at the feet. Then, straightening himself, he said to the man—and the heroism, the manhood, the Christlike spirit of it all!—he said: "You are free." Overcome, Javert went out and took his own life. And then—but the story is a long one and cannot be told here. There is no book so filled with tears as this account of the outcasts. And we can never think of Jean Valjean without an indescribable feeling of reverence and of awe. We can readily imagine the night on which he died; that it was starless and intensely dark, and, as Hugo says, that "some immense angel was standing in the gloom with outstretched wings, waiting for the soul."

The American people have maintained their rights; but, more, the American people have sensed a finer thing than the maintenance of rights by physical force. In the magic of Mr. Wilson's words, for example, they, and indeed the rest of the world, have seen the vision of that force which creates, directs, and controls physical force—a superior force, a hyper-resistance, a force, indeed, that overcomes greed by ideals, evil by good, wrong by righteousness. This hyper-resistance, in spite of the abuse of the police power in mill and mine, has not been lost out of American life by anything that has happened through the war.

ENJOYMENT

The moralists tell us that it is proper that we should get all the enjoyment possible out of life, as long as we maintain it a dutiful once. That is good American doctrine still. This does not mean a return to Epicurus; it is the wholesome American enjoyment in well-doing, in going and coming, in working and in playing, in all

things whatsoever. Have fun, says the American still. If the job be irksome, do it—and play golf. It is American to hitch an avocation to the vocation, just for fun. There must be fun.

During the stress of his journalistic career, Horace Greely was wont to escape from New York now and then for a day to find fun in working on his farm up the Hudson. He called it his "hobby" and insisted that a man draws life from his hobby; that in truth a man without a hobby has his part soon played in the world. That is now typically American. Oliver Wendell Holmes took photographs and found fun working at a turning-lathe during his leisure moments. Joseph Jefferson said that his pictures, good or bad, saved his reason and his life when both were threatened by the monotony of his professional tasks. Charlotte Yonge's advice to mothers was, "keep a good novel in your work-basket—for repairs." The sweet-spirited Francis of Assisi gave up all the attractions of his noble birth-right, asking no help from any man, taking up his epoch-making work naked and penniless, trusting to the Lord only to clothe and feed him. But this same Francis kept his violin, and in the lonely places rested from the sadness of his work with the lepers, as he played. The popularity of competitive sports, of the theater and the dance, of the funny story, the newspaper cartoon, are all evidence of the persistence of the will to fun among us American folk.

CONCLUSION

America is not only a synonym for opportunity; in spite of the war, in part because of it, America means also health, discipline, sincerity, ambition, usefulness, bravery, hyper-resistance to the wrong, enjoyment. America understands this. More, she feels it. Better still, she will keep at the business of working out these qualities concretely, because it is decidedly American to make use of such personal qualities as lead to self-culture. The war has not destroyed this hopeful American trait.

SWITZERLAND, HOLLAND, AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By Dr. B. DE JONG VAN BEEK EN DONK

SWITZERLAND

ON THE 19th of November, at 8 o'clock in the morning—at an early hour, when probably the majority of the members of parliaments of other countries are still asleep and it would be very difficult to collect the legal quorum necessary to pass a resolution, to say nothing of the assembling of a complete parliament, such as is desirable for solemn occasions—the Swiss National Council, after six days of discussion, adopted the proposal of the government for its entrance into the League of Nations by 124 votes to 45 votes. This was immediately followed by a discussion about the few various articles, and punctually at 11 o'clock the decisive final voting took place. The National Assembly decided by 128 votes to 43, therefore with a three-quarter majority, and in the absence of 18 members (including the vacancies caused by death and the en-

forced absence of the imprisoned Grimm), to empower the Federal Council to notify the signatory powers of the entrance of Switzerland into the League of Nations, with, however, the reservation that this decision, which was confirmed two days later by the States Council, must be ratified by a plebiscite.

The majority is large, surprisingly large even for the most optimistic adherents, who at most had reckoned on a two-thirds majority; nevertheless, we will not be deluded into thinking that the result of the plebiscite is surely to be favorable also, but one of the most prominent members of western Switzerland declared to me lately that a very energetic propaganda was still necessary among the German-speaking Swiss, and that there was a fear that several deputies of the peasant class who had personally agreed to the entrance into the League had not many votes behind them. So much is certain, that the opponents have not the intention of giving up the fight. It was known in advance that the social democrats would mobilize their whole following to refuse the "capitalist" League of Nations.

The energetic manner in which the leader of the Catholic conservative party, von Streng, and the peasants' representative, Bopp, placed themselves in opposition to the bill proved beyond a doubt that also on this side the League of Nations will continue to meet with the utmost opposition, while the fact that the radical party also presents a number of opponents, and that the opposition disposes of popular speakers like Gelpke and Knellwolf, makes the result of the referendum quite uncertain.

The last day of the general conference was one of the most interesting. The Council devoted itself to the problem from 8 o'clock a. m. till 12 o'clock, and from 4 till 8 p. m. with inexhaustible interest, more than a hundred members constantly being present. The "great" speeches had been given on the preceding days. The most distinguished speakers, such as Horace Micheli, A. de Meuron, de Dardel from western Switzerland, Borella from Tessin, Scherrer-Füllemann, Frey and Forrer from German Switzerland, had emphasized the advantages of the entrance in carefully weighed speeches, with a whole battery of arguments. Their speeches, as well as the masterly and ably compiled *plaidoyer* of the member Calonder, are worth reading for the strength of their grounds of argument and prove how earnestly the Swiss National Assembly has studied the problem of the League of Nations and how much healthy idealism will be devoted to the development of the League in the right direction. Opposed to these were the no less carefully collected arguments of the Socialist leaders, Gustav Müller and Maine, on the one side, and the bourgeois opponents, von Streng, Professor Zürcher, Gelpke, Knellwolf, etc., on the other.

This was all of interest, but the series of long and splendid speeches wearied the audience. On Tuesday, the final day, it was more interesting, although the discussions were not enlivened and lightened by interruptions, as is often the case in other parliaments, one of the peculiarities of the Swiss Parliament being that interruptions are entirely unknown there. However, on the last day, there were more improvised speeches—final efforts to still try and convince one or other of the opponents. Especially there was an attempt made to appeal to the moderate half of the Socialists. It was interesting to hear how first the Grütlian Wirz, and then two

members, who a few weeks ago were still members, of the Socialist fraction, Jean Sigg from Geneva and Frei of Basle, demonstrated to the Swiss Socialists how, just as Socialists, they should support this endeavor for the suppression of war. They referred to the attitude of their comrades in other countries—to Henderson, Ramsay Macdonald, Smillie, and others, who had just issued a powerful manifesto in England in favor of the League of Nations; and to Albert Thomas and other French Socialists, who had adopted a similar attitude in their own country.

Shortly after the member of the Federal Council, Schulthess, who delivered the closing speech in the name of the government, addressed himself specially to the representatives of the working classes. He maintained that if Switzerland did not join the League of Nations, it naturally could not count much on the good-will of the big powers as regards the delivery of raw materials and other articles of urgent necessity. This would signify a danger for all industry. "What can I say to the employers in a plea for the workers' interests if they assert that the workman has himself made it impossible for them to improve his position by his having raised his voice against the entry of Switzerland into the League of Nations?"

One wondered whether, after the forcible arguments of their former comrades, Sigg, etc., as well as the urgent warning of the member Schulthess against the economic disadvantages which would accrue in case of non-entry, some of the moderate Socialists would abandon their resistance. The final voting proved that those who had hoped for converts by discussion were again the poorer by an illusion. The party unanimously refused. Party discipline? or does such a deep cleft really divide even the so-called moderate Swiss Socialists, such as Müller, Greulich, and Studer, from the adherents of the Second International in other countries?

The reasons brought forward by the opponents in the bourgeois parties were of various kinds. As usual, "human nature" was referred to, which would always sanction warfare. This was specially answered by the more idealistic western Swiss, like Micheli, that the present disgust of war should be utilized to drive men now to exclaim, "Never again!" It was said it would be unchivalrous to join a league of the victors. To this it was replied that the vanquished themselves had lately expressed the hope that the League of Nations would adopt a more universal character by the entrance into it of the neutral States.

There was a fear that Germany would be excluded from it for a considerable time. To this it was replied (and Schulthess of the Federal Council employed his whole eloquence on this point) that the misery and the requirements of the whole world would meanwhile enforce a Union of all countries. This was already proved by the Labor Conference in Washington.

A disinclination was shown to an entrance enforced by the Entente and to the subjection of the smaller States. "Rather death than life in slavery!" said Knellwolf. To which Spahn, the president of the preparatory commission, dryly replied, that "during the war not a little slavery had to be endured to enable one to live!" Further, that the principle of unanimity regarding the decisions of the League of Nations was a guarantee against too great a restriction of freedom.

The most important argument of the opponent was, however, the damage to Swiss vital interests by the renunciation of the ancient neutrality. Federal Councillor Schulthess refuted this reason with the greatest distinctness. The military neutrality will continue by reason of article 435 of the peace treaty, and will remain unweakened even by the participation in the League of Nations, whereas the economic neutrality cannot be maintained if the League of Nations prescribes a joint action against the peace-disturbing State." "Does any one believe," said Mr. Schulthess, "that if we do not join in the League of Nations and continue to trade with the boycotted States that the members of the League of Nations will continue their commercial relations with us? They would simply close their frontiers to us, and the result would be that as a member of the League of Nations we could trade with the whole world, excepting the boycotted State, while as a non-member we were entitled to continue our connections with this State, but thus be cut off from all intercourse with the rest of the world."

Against these arguments there is nothing to be said, in my opinion. Apart from the idealistic considerations, which have certainly contributed in no small measure to the favorable decision, also the economic interests of Switzerland call for its entrance into the League of Nations.

HOLLAND

In the opening speech which Queen Wilhelmina held at the session of the Dutch Parliament on September 16th, she said the following to the representatives of her people about Holland's position toward the Versailles League of Nations: "If once the League of Nations has become a fact, the joining of Holland will be put before you for ratification."

The position of the Dutch Government seems consequently to be the same as that of the majority of the Swiss National Council: principally willingness to join the League of Nations, but only when it is certain that the present opposition in the American Senate does not give the League of Nations the death-blow before it actually comes into being.

That Holland is ready to become a member of the League of Nations was certain from the very first moment. The view of the majority of the Dutch who have thought about this problem at all was already brought forth at the meeting of the "Dutch Association for International Law" at the end of last March, when from all sides the sharpest criticism was uttered against the terms of the Versailles League of Nations Covenant, yet at the same time there was acknowledged that it was in Holland's own interest, as well as its duty toward humanity, to join, and so to help improve the League of Nations Covenant.

This point of view has evidently remained the same with the majority. It is the custom that immediately after the opening speech of the Queen all political newspapers take up the discussion of the matter. The only large newspaper which in its commentary showed some signs of doubt about the joining of the League of Nations was the organ of the former very influential, now rather isolated, Calvinistic leader, the Minister of State, Kuyper. His paper, *De Standaard*, opposes the League of Nations

because "it compels the abandonment of rather a large portion of sovereignty," and he finds it peculiar that the government has already induced the Queen to declare herself ready for it.

But this opposing voice stands isolated. The other papers consider the joining of the League of Nations as something quite natural and are, with the *Amsterdamer Handelsblad*, of opinion "that the present League of Nations may be the germ wherefrom a better international organization might grow."

That the government will wait until the League of Nations has become a certainty before a draft of a bill for ratification of Holland's adherence is laid before the parliament finds no opposition in the press. The much-read liberal *Nieuwe Courant* (The Hague) is praising this postponement, because it thinks that the people round about in the country are not quite aware of the great significance which the joining has, and through the postponement the public opinion may be better prepared, so that the people's representatives will at least know at the moment of taking decision what thoughts and opinions prevail among the people.

Two very important newspapers are not quite content, because they had expected that the government would speak with more enthusiasm about Holland's duty in the interest of an international land organization; they are the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, Holland's largest daily paper, and *Het Volk*, the organ of the Socialist Party. The *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* puts in the foreground of her leading article of September 4th "that the Versailles League of Nations was a disappointment." It calls special attention to the fact that, to serve its high aim, the League of Nations ought to satisfy four demands: 1, Impartiality; 2, insurmountable military predominance against the national forces; 3, large legislative authority, whereby the League would not only become a "league to enforce peace," but also a "league to enforce progress"; 4, democratic composition of the League of Nations organs.

In order to enable Holland to give an energetic collaboration in this direction, immediate adherence to the League of Nations is necessary, in spite of all its present imperfections. "There is so much at stake just now. It all depends in what spirit the League of Nations is carried on within the first few months, not only by the great powers, but by all large and small nations together. Here lies the imminent part of the work. A gigantic fight will be necessary in order to get a league of nations somewhat different and somewhat more powerful than the unsuccessful work of the two Hague conferences. This fight is too closely associated with our vital interests as that we could remain sheer onlookers or figures."

Thus writes the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* on September 4th. Now, after the opening speech of the Queen, the paper is naturally very glad that the government thinks Holland's joining of the League of Nations as compatible with its interests. The paper is only sorry that the speech does not state anything about the spirit in which the Netherlands think to take part in the League and in what direction Holland hopes to use her influence for the further development of the League. "Will Holland become a member because there is no other way, and will it, after its adherence, only run

along with the other States, or will it try to play an active part, as we recommend it? This is the great question to which the people expect an answer. Yet the speech of the Queen is quite negative about it."

In a similar spirit writes the social democratic paper, *Het Volk*. It is well known that the Dutch Social Democratic Party belongs to the Second International. The position of the Dutch Social Democrats toward the League of Nations is for this reason quite different to the position of, for instance, the Swiss Socialists. After the speech of the Queen *Het Volk* wrote: "The government of a State that has remained neutral ought to have shown, in a document like this, that it intends to take a very active part in the development of the present international organization into a real league of nations. But, for this, faith in a better future must be alive, and this faith seems to be wanting."

The Social Democratic organ discusses its position toward the League of Nations more fully in a leading article on September 23: "How faulty the composition and organization of the League of Nations may be, the institution must be accepted, not only a league of nations on a just basis, but also this unjust league of nations; not only a league of nations in the air, but also this league, which will very soon start its function, because it is the bearer of two principles, and without their application a new growing of the civilization is impossible—peaceful settlement of all conflicts and disarmament. If it results that the League of Nations works faulty, because big mistakes exist in its organization and composition, then the peoples will press upon the improvement of these mistakes. The peoples will not tolerate that a once-created institution which promises the redemption from wars is checked in its work by diplomatic games, militaristic ambitions, or the rapacity of influential groups. Thus bad, no league of nations can be, as that the peoples will not be able to turn it over into some blessed power in favor of peace and disarmament. For this reason we recommend Holland the joining of even this crooked League of Nations."

This opinion of the Social Democratic organ is the same as that of the large pacifist unions, which have united themselves these days into a new Dutch central organization, "Dutch Association for Peace and League of Nations," and whose leaders belong to various political directions, and all of them recommend, without exception, Holland's immediate joining of the League.

The American Commission to Poland, headed by Henry Morgenthau, former Ambassador to Turkey and a leader of the Jews in the United States, which was named by the Department of State, at the request of President Paderewski, to investigate the status of the Jews of Poland, has reported. The Polish nation as a whole is absolved from responsibility for the violence of uncontrolled troops and local mobs based on anti-Semitic feelings. An economic boycott of Jews on a considerable scale is reported, but the Polish Government stands pledged to put an end to it as far as it can be done by governmental action. The Zionist aspirations of many of the Jews undoubtedly have run counter to the Polish ideals of nationalism, and have been a cause of friction; as also has been their successful fight at Paris to bring about the guarantee of the rights of religious, racial, and linguistic minorities in Poland.



A. B. Chapin in St. Louis Republic

THE TREATY OF PEACE SIGNED

Signatory Allied Powers Define Attitude— Germany's Mood for the Future— Japan's Imperial Rescript

On January 10 the Treaty of Versailles, making peace between Germany and the Allied Powers, was made effective by exchange of ratifications, Baron Kurt von Lersner, head of the German mission, having previously signed the protocol of November 1, providing for reparation for the sinking of the German warships at Scapa Flow and to insure the carrying out of the armistice terms. The document was signed in the office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Paris, and the ceremony was devoid of any unusual dramatic features.

As long ago as last October a sufficient number of the powers had ratified the treaty to comply with its requirements as to effectiveness. The delay in formal ratification has been due to the failure of Germany to live up to some of the terms of the armistice and to the insistence of the Allied Supreme Council that before the treaty was put into effect Germany should further guarantee action in this respect, and also meet additional demands for reparation following the sinking of the fleet at Scapa Flow.

After the exchange of ratifications, Premier Clemenceau handed to Baron von Lersner the following letter:

"PARIS, January 10.

"Now that the protocol provided for by the note of November 2 has been signed by qualified representatives of the German Government, and in consequence the ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles have been deposited, the Allied and Associated Powers wish to renew to the German Government their assurance that, while necessary reparations for the